COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO GIVE *COLLIGNONICERAS* BREISTROFFER, 1947, PRIORITY AS FROM 1876. Z.N.(S.) 1738

(see this volume, pages 57–59)

By R. V. Melville (*London*)

I support the underlying purpose of this proposal, but not the method whereby it is proposed to achieve it. The situation is that whereas *Collignoniceras* was proposed expressly as a replacement-name for *Prionotropis* Meek, 1876, *non* Fieber, 1853, *Selwynoceras* was not, and has a type-species which can never be the nominal type-species of *Collignoniceras*. *Selwynoceras* is therefore a valid replacement for *Prionotropis* Meek, non Fieber only for those who hold *Ammonites woolgari* Mantell and *Prionotropis*? *borealis* Warren to be congeneric and consubgeneric. Wright and Matsumoto hold that for these palaeontologists, *Collignoniceras* Breistroffer, 1947, should have priority over *Selwynoceras* Warren and Stelck, 1940.

This object could surely be achieved without going to the lengths of giving *Collignoniceras* priority as from the date (1876) of the name it replaced, thereby accepting a particular case of a general rule that was struck out of the Code by the Washington (1963) Congress. It would be sufficient for the Commission, in placing *Collignoniceras* Breistroffer, 1947, on the Official List, to direct that it be given priority over *Selwynoceras* Warren and Stelck, 1940, by those authors who hold the two names to be synonymous at any level within the genus-group.

COMMENT ON CHRYSOPINAE IN NEUROPTERA AND DIPTERA, Z.N.(S.) 1725

(see volume 22, pages 332–333)

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.*)

The proposal to distinguish the dipterous group by the spelling Chrysopsinae is reasonable and appropriate. Opinion 140 (1943) established a precedent for such cases, when it distinguished Meropidae from *Merops* and Meropeidae from *Merope*. For a similar proposal see Sabrosky and Zimmerman, 1966, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **23** : 46–47, who propose Trypetesinae and Trypetesini (from *Trypetes* Schoenherr) to avoid homonymy with group names based on *Trypeta* Meigen.

The subfamily name Chrysopinae in Diptera dates from Lutz, 1905, *Rev. Soc. Sci. Sao Paulo* **1** : 21. Actually, the earliest use of a group name based on *Chrysops* antedates that based on *Chrysopa*, but it was in a vernacular form: Chrysopites Blanchard, 1840, *Histoire naturelle des Insectes* (volume 3 of Castelnau's *Histoire naturelle des Animaux Articulés*): 588, 590. In a later work (1845, *Histoire des Insectes* **2** : 471, 474), Blanchard emended the name to Chrysopsites, still in the vernacular but foreshadowing the proposal by Tjeder.

Chrysops should be recorded as of masculine gender on several grounds. It was decided by the Commission at its meeting in Washington in 1963 to issue a Declaration (still not formulated) that *-ops* names are to be considered of masculine gender (1964, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **21** : 172, Case 18). Furthermore, although the sole originally included species, *caecutiens*, did not indicate the gender of *Chrysops*, in Meigen's subsequent treatment of the genus (1820, *Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten europäischen zweiflügeligen Insekten*, **2** : 65–75), he clearly and consistently used *Chrysops* as masculine (*italicus*, *relictus*, *pictus*, *quadratus*, etc.). Still earlier, Fabricius (1805, *Systema Antliatorum:* 110–113) had also treated it as masculine (*ferrugatus*, *fenestratus*, *costatus*, *viduatus*, *pellucidus*).